

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Steven Blair Camden,)	Civil Action No. 6:14-4554-BHH
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	ORDER AND OPINION
)	
City of Greenville, Officer Shelton,)	
Jimmy Digirolamo, Mary Thomas,)	
Benjamin Thomas, Alia Paramore,)	
Richard Schwartz, Charlse Lane, Jamie)	
Lepak, B. W. Lusk, Diana M. Cadavid,)	
P.C. Loyd, Jeff Burdette, R. C. Hall,)	
Adam Kearney, Melissa Lawson,)	
Ronald Powell, Benedict Sambrano,)	
Jessica Hawkins, Joshua Tankersley,)	
Nathan Smith, Samuel Holbrooks,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

Plaintiff Steven Blair Camden (“the plaintiff”), proceeding *pro se*, brought this action pursuant to Title 42, United States Code, Section 1983. (ECF No. 1.) In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B), D.S.C., this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Jacquelyn D. Austin for pre-trial handling and a Report and Recommendation (“Report”).

This matter is before the Court on the defendants (“the defendants”) motions to dismiss were filed on February 13, 2015 (ECF Nos. 21, 22.) The plaintiff filed no response to the motions to dismiss.

On April 22, 2015, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation in which she recommended that the case be dismissed pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b). The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility for making a final determination remains with

this court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270, 96 S.Ct. 549, 46 L.Ed.2d 483 (1976). The Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the Report and Recommendation or may recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). ‘The authority of a court to dismiss *sua sponte* for lack of prosecution has generally been considered an ‘inherent power,’ governed not by rule or statute but by the control necessarily vested in courts to manage their own affairs so as to achieve the orderly and expeditious disposition of cases.” See *Link v. Wabash R.R. Co.*, 370 U.S. 626, 630–31, 82 S.Ct. 1386, 8 L.Ed.2d 734 (1962). As well as inherent authority, this Court may *sua sponte* dismiss a case for lack of prosecution under Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b). *Id.* at 630.

The plaintiff was advised of his right to file objections to the Report and Recommendation. (ECF No. 30-1.) Plaintiff filed no objections and the time for doing so expired on May 12, 2015. In the absence of objections to the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation, this Court is not required to provide an explanation for adopting the recommendation. See *Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). Rather, “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 and advisory committee’s note). Plaintiff has failed to comply with this Court’s orders. As such, the Court finds that this case should be dismissed pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

After a careful review of the record, the applicable law, and the Report and Recommendation, the Court finds the Magistrate Judge’s recommendation to be proper.

Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation is incorporated herein by reference and this action is DISMISSED with prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/Bruce Howe Hendricks
United States District Judge

July 31, 2015
Greenville, South Carolina

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

The parties are hereby notified that any right to appeal this Order is governed by Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.